



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/466,627	12/17/1999	MING-LING LO	YO999-429	1398

7590

11/28/2003

ANNE E BARSCHALL
80 BENEDICT AVENUE
TARRYTOWN, NY 10591

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2003

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

MAILED

Technology Center 2100

MAILED

NOV 24 2003

Technology Center 2100

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/656,533

Applicant(s)

MAFFEZONI, GUIDO

Examiner

Thomas J. Mauro Jr.

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 September 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 September 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-25 are pending. A formal action on the merits of claims 1-25 follows.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show GUI screenshots of the configuration process and username/password issuing as described in the specification. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Regarding claim 17, the phrase "may" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

7. Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Orr et al. (U.S. 6,463,459).

With respect to claim 1, Orr teaches a method for enabling access to resources connected to client nodes of a network, the method comprising:

- establishing communication between a local client and a remote client [**Orr --Figures 4 and 5 and Col. 5 lines 57-60 – Remote client, i.e. agent, sends request to local client, i.e. broker**], the local client being configured to provide a remote client identification

Art Unit: 2143

- code and a password to the remote client [Orr -- **Figures 4 and 5, Col. 1 lines 63-65 and Col. 5 line 62 – User logs on to the system, which inherently requires a username and password**] using a DCOM enabled link [Orr -- **Col. 6 lines 40-44**], the establishing being completed by confirmation from the remote client that the remote client identification code and the password match [Orr -- **Col. 5 lines 66-67 – Col. 6 lines 1-6 – Confirmation occurs if broker, i.e. local client, provides confirmed inter-process communication (IPC) resources**];
- determining if adapters are connected to the remote client [Orr -- **Col. 6 lines 45-53 – Inherently required once virtual desktop is set-up to determine which adapters, i.e. hard drive, CD-Rom, etc... agent has access to**];
 - establishing connection to a selected adapter [Orr -- **Col. 6 lines 45-53 – Inherently required for agent to run programs and access files on local client, i.e. broker**]; and
 - connecting the local client to the selected adapter [Orr -- **Col. 6 lines 45-53 – Inherently required for agent to execute commands on local client, i.e. broker**], the selected adapter being configured to appear on a first graphical user interface (GUI) of the local client as if the selected adapter of the remote client were physically connected to the local client [Orr -- **Col. 3 lines 40-44 – Virtual desktop, i.e. GUI, shows local client, i.e. broker, as if all applications and peripherals were connected to the remote client, i.e. agent**].

With respect to claim 6, Orr-Guheen teach the invention substantially as claimed including having the local client provide the remote client identification and the password using

Art Unit: 2143

a third graphical user interface (GUI) [Orr -- **Figures 3 and 4 and Col. 5 lines 59-62 – In order for client to logon to server, server must issue and send to client the logon credentials, i.e. username and password**].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr et al. (U.S. 6,463,459) as applied to claim 1, in view of Guheen et al. (U.S. 6,615,166).

Regarding claim 2, Orr teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including the local client providing a computer identification to the remote client prior to establishing communication between the local client and the remote client, the computer information containing the remote client identification code and connection password [Orr -- **Col. 5 lines 60-62 – Local client is required to provide log on information to remote client before the remote client can log on to the system**]. Orr fails to teach an access password. Guheen, however, teaches having multiple user id(s) and passwords to access subsystems within a server [Guheen -- **Col. 148 lines 59-65 – Access passwords, aside from standard login, allows access to specific resources**].

Art Unit: 2143

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of access passwords for accessing specific resources, as taught by Guheen into the invention of Orr, in order to provide a more secure means for authenticating and providing access to information rather than using a single password/sign-on.

Regarding claim 3, Orr-Guheen teach the invention substantially as claimed including the aforementioned limitations in claim 2, including choosing the selected adapter using a second graphical user interface (GUI) [**Orr -- Col. 6 lines 45-53 – Access to adapters are inherently required for agent to run programs and access files on local client, i.e. broker**]; and providing the access password using the second GUI [**Guheen -- Col. 148 lines 59-65 – Access passwords, aside from standard login, allows access to specific resources, i.e. adapters**].

10. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr et al. (U.S. 6,463,459).

Claims 4-5 describe enabling access to resources connected to client nodes on a network wherein the remote client functions as a server for the local client (claim 4) and wherein the local client functions as a server for the remote client (claim 5).

Orr-Guheen discloses the remote client, i.e. broker, provides server access for the local client, i.e. agent [**Orr -- Figure 1 and Col. 3 lines 8-10 – Remote requester, i.e. client, accesses server, i.e. broker**]. As is known in the art, any device or computer at any point in the time can access another computer, i.e. server, to access resources. At the same time, that device

Art Unit: 2143

or computer can act as a server for another computer wanting some resource. As was upheld in *In re Gazda* (219 F.2d 449, 104 USPQ 400 (CCPA 1955)), reversal of parts, in this case switching a client to be a server and a server to be a client, is an obvious modification to a system.

11. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Kempf et al. (U.S. 6,374,308).

Regarding claim 7, Orr teaches the invention as aforementioned in claim 1 above, but fail to teach a local client user clicking on an icon to access the adapter.

Kempf, however, teaches accessing an adapter object by clicking on a GUI object [**Kempf -- Col. 6 lines 43-46**].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the accessing of remote adapters by clicking on an icon, as taught by Kempf into the invention of Orr, in order to provide a connection between a distributed device and a graphical user interface.

Regarding claim 8, Orr-Kempf teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the selected adapter connected to the remote client does not differentiate between the local client and the remote client when the local client is accessing the selected adapter [**Orr -- Col. 6 lines 31-53 -- Client accesses resources using a virtual desktop, upon which full control is given as if applications and files were local**].

12. Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr, as applied to claim 1 above, in view of McNeill, Jr. et al. (U.S. 5,721,880).

Regarding claim 9, Orr teaches the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 1, but fails to teach the sending inquiry commands to the remote client to determine if adapters are connected.

McNeill, however, teaches this limitation substantially as claimed, sending inquiry commands to the remote client [**McNeill -- Col. 5 lines 12-18 – SCSI Inquiry commands are sent to determine which devices are available**].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the sending of SCSI inquiry commands, as taught by McNeill into the invention of Orr, in order to provide a means to determine the availability of a specific type of adapter, i.e. SCSI adapter, on the remote client/server.

Regarding claim 10, Orr-McNeill teach the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the inquiry commands are SCSI commands [**McNeill -- Col. 5 lines 15-16 – SCSI inquiry commands**].

Regarding claim 11, Orr-McNeill teach the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the SCSI commands are encapsulated in packets suitable for DCOM transmission [**Orr -- Col. 6 lines 40-44 – If the request is from a remote user, packets are sent out using DCOM.**]

Therefore, SCSI inquiry commands are encapsulated and sent out over the communications link using DCOM].

13. Claims 12, 15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr et al. (U.S. 6,463,459) in view of McNeill, Jr. et al. (U.S. 5,721,880).

Regarding claim 12, Orr teaches the invention substantially as claimed, the method comprising:

configuring a local client and a remote client for remote connectivity [**Orr -- Figures 4 and 5 and Col. 5 lines 57-60 – Remote client, i.e. agent, communicates with local client, i.e. broker, to send requests**] using a distributed component object model (DCOM) enabled link [**Orr -- Col. 6 lines 40-44**], where the local client provides a remote client identification and a connection password to the remote client during the configuration operation [**Orr -- Figures 4 and 5, Col. 1 lines 63-65 and Col. 5 line 62 – User logs on to the system, which inherently requires a username and password**];

determining if host adapters are connected to the remote client [**Orr -- Col. 6 lines 45-53 – Inherently required once virtual desktop is set-up to determine which adapters, i.e. hard drive, CD-Rom, etc... agent has access to**];

selecting a host adapter connected to the remote client [**Orr -- Col. 6 lines 45-53 – Access to adapters are inherently required for agent to run programs and access files on local client, i.e. broker**]; and

communicating with the selected host adapter, where the local client accesses and uses the selected host adapter as if the selected host adapter belonged to the local client [**Orr -- Col. 3 lines 40-44 – Virtual desktop, i.e. GUI, shows local client, i.e. broker, as if all applications and peripherals were connected to the remote client, i.e. agent, locally**].

Orr fails to teach accessing small computer system interface (SCSI) devices and using SCSI devices in the system.

McNeill, however, teaches accessing non-local SCSI devices, which includes sending out SCSI inquiry commands to detect SCSI adapters and connecting to them [**McNeill -- Col. 5 lines 12-18 – SCSI Inquiry commands are sent to determine which devices are available**].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the connectivity to non-local SCSI devices, as taught by McNeill into the invention to Orr, in order to provide a means to determine the availability of a specific type of adapter, i.e. SCSI adapter, on the remote client/server and to connect to these non-local devices.

Regarding claim 15, Orr-McNeill teach the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the SCSI host adapters connected to the remote client are configured to appear on a graphical user interface (GUI) of the local client as if the SCSI host adapters belong to the local client [**Orr -- Col. 3 lines 40-44 – Virtual desktop, i.e. GUI, shows local client, i.e. broker, as if all applications and peripherals belong to the remote client, i.e. agent, locally**].

Regarding claim 19, this claim contains limitations similar to the limitations in claim 6. Therefore, claim 19 is rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2143

14. Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr et al.

(U.S. 6,463,459), *As Applied to claim 12 above. jfm*

Regarding claims 13-14, these are similar in nature to claims 4 and 5, as they set forth the same limitations. Therefore, claims 13-14 are rejected under the same rationale.

15. Claims 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr-McNeill as applied to claim 15, in view of Kempf et al. (U.S. 6,374,308).

Regarding claim 16-17, Orr-McNeill teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claims 12 and 15 above, but fail to teach having a SCSI host adapter icon in which the user can select the adapter by clicking on the icon.

Kempf, however, teaches wherein the SCSI host adapters are configured as SCSI host adapter icons on the GUI of the local client (claim 16) and wherein a user selects the selected SCSI host adapter by clicking on a SCSI host adapter icon on the GUI of the local client (claim 17) [**Kempf -- Col. 6 lines 43-46 – Host adapter icon appear on the GUI, allowing user to select adapter and click on icon for access**].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of SCSI host adapter icons on the GUI of the local client which provide access to the adapter through clicking on them, as taught by Kempf into the invention of Orr, in order to provide a direct connection between a distributed device and a graphical user interface object.

16. Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr-McNeill, as applied to claim 12 above, in view of Guheen et al. (U.S. 6,615,166).

Regarding claim 18, Orr-McNeill teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 12, but fail to teach the use of an access password to access the SCSI host adapter.

Guheen, however, teaches the use of an access password to access specific resources of a system, separate from a general sign-on, i.e. username and password [**Guheen -- Col. 148 lines 59-65 -- Accessing specific resources requires the entering of a second password, i.e. access password**].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of access passwords for accessing specific resources, as taught by Guheen into the invention of Orr, in order to provide a more secure means for authenticating and providing access to information rather than using a single password/sign-on.

Regarding claim 20, Orr-McNeill-Guheen teach the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the local client selects the selected SCSI host adapter [**Kempf -- Col. 6 lines 43-46 -- Host adapter icon appear on the GUI, allowing user to select adapter and click on icon for access**] and inputs the access password using a graphical user interface (GUI) [**Guheen -- Col. 148 lines 59-65 -- Accessing specific resources requires the entering of a second password, i.e. access password, which is presented to the user's GUI before access is allowed**].

17. Claims 21, 23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr et al. (U.S. 6,463,459), in view of McNeill, Jr. et al. (U.S. 5,721,880) and Kempf et al. (U.S. 6,374,308).

Regarding claim 21, Orr teaches the invention substantially as claimed, a method for accessing resources connected to remotely located client nodes on a network, the resources being displayed on a first graphical user interface (GUI) of a local client, the method comprising:

configuring the local client and a remote client for remote connectivity [**Orr -- Figures 4 and 5 and Col. 5 lines 57-60 – Remote client, i.e. agent, communicates with local client, i.e. broker, to send requests**], the local client having a remote client identification and a connection password which allows access to the remote client [**Orr -- Figures 4 and 5, Col. 1 lines 63-65 and Col. 5 line 62 – User logs on to the system, which inherently requires a username and password**] using a distributed component object model (DCOM) enabled link [**Orr -- Col. 6 lines 40-44**];

determining if host adapters are connected to the remote client [**Orr -- Col. 6 lines 45-53 – Inherently required once virtual desktop is set-up to determine which adapters, i.e. hard drive, CD-Rom, etc... agent has access to**]; and

communicating with the host adapter, the host adapter appearing on the GUI of the local client as if the SCSI host adapter belonged to the local client [**Orr -- Col. 3 lines 40-44 – Virtual desktop, i.e. GUI, shows local client, i.e. broker, as if all applications and peripherals were connected to the remote client, i.e. agent, locally**].

Orr fails to teach accessing small computer system interface (SCSI) devices and using SCSI

Art Unit: 2143

devices in the system and providing a clickable icon on the GUI of the client which provides direct access to the SCSI adapter.

McNeill, however, teaches accessing non-local SCSI devices, which includes sending out SCSI inquiry commands to detect SCSI adapters and connecting to them [**McNeill -- Col. 5 lines 12-18 – SCSI Inquiry commands are sent to determine which devices are available**].

Furthermore, Kempf teaches wherein the SCSI host adapters are configured as SCSI host adapter icons on the GUI of the local client and wherein a user selects the selected SCSI host adapter by clicking on a SCSI host adapter icon on the GUI of the local client [**Kempf -- Col. 6 lines 43-46 – Host adapter icon appear on the GUI, allowing user to select adapter and click on icon for access**].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the connectivity to non-local SCSI devices through the use of clickable icon(s) on the GUI of the client, as taught by McNeill and Kempf into the invention to Orr, in order to provide a means to determine the availability of a specific type of adapter, i.e. SCSI adapter, on the remote client/server and to connect to these non-local devices, in addition to providing a direct connection between a distributed device and a graphical user interface object..

Regarding claim 23, Orr-McNeill-Kempf teach the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the local client inputs the remote client identification and the connection password using a second GUI which allows for remote SCSI connection [**Orr -- Col. 5 lines 60-62 – Local client is required to provide log on information to remote client before the remote client can log on to the system**].

Regarding claim 25, Orr-McNeill-Kempf teach the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the local client communicates with the remote client using SCSI commands [McNeill -- Col. 3 lines 18-20 – Communication with SCSI devices require using SCSI commands].

18. Claims 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr et al. (U.S. 6,463,459), in view of McNeill, Jr. et al. (U.S. 5,721,880) and Kempf et al. (U.S. 6,374,308) and Guheen et al. (U.S. 6,615,166).

Regarding claim 22, Orr-Kempf-McNeill teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 21 above, but fails to teach providing an access password to access the SCSI host adapter.

Guheen, however, teaches the use of an access password to access specific resources of a system, separate from a general sign-on, i.e. username and password [Guheen -- Col. 148 lines 59-65 – Accessing specific resources requires the entering of a second password, i.e. access password].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of access passwords for accessing specific resources, as taught by Guheen into the invention of Orr, in order to provide a more secure means for authenticating and providing access to information rather than using a single password/sign-on.

Regarding claim 24, Orr-McNeill-Kempf-Guheen teach the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the access password is input using a third GUI which allows for host adapter selection [**Kempf -- Col. 6 lines 43-46 – Host adapter icon appears on the GUI, allowing user to select adapter and click on icon for access, upon which access password is required to access resource**].

Conclusion

19. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Zarrow (U.S. 5,991,813) discloses a communications method for access to a remote SCSI device located on a remote computer.
- Powderly et al. (U.S. 6,560,641) discloses a method for remotely controlling a peripheral device located on a remote computer.
- Hertzog et al. (U.S. Pub. 2003/0069874) discloses a method for communicating between two computers across a network using a DCOM link.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Mauro Jr. whose telephone number is 703-605-1234. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00a.m. - 4:30p.m..

Art Unit: 2143

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.



TJM
November 19, 2003



BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
PRIMARY EXAMINER